



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/748,375	12/30/2003	Vinod Anupam	16-13-17	8153
22046 7590 12/11/2008 Docket Administrator - Room 2F-192 Alcatel-Lucent USA Inc. 600-700 Mountain Avenue Murray Hill, NJ 07974				
EXAMINER				
HONG, HARRY S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2614				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/11/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/748,375

**Applicant(s)**

ANUPAM ET AL.

**Examiner**

Harry S. Hong

**Art Unit**

2614

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 August 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 17-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 16 and 26 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 August 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
  1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
  2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
  4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
4. Claims 1, 8, 10-15, 17, 22, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mayer et al. (Mayer; US 6,823,055 B1; previously cited and applied) in view of Emery et al. (Emery; 5,353,331; cited by the examiner and applied for the first time).

With respect to claims 1, 8, 11, 12, 17, and 22, the claimed invention reads on Mayer as follows. The claimed receiving a request from the user to initiate emulation of a home telecommunications environment is taught at column 3, lines 50 – 54. The claimed receiving authentication information from the user indicating the user's association with the home telecommunications environment is taught at column 2, lines 32 -35. The claimed determining a home telecommunications network which is associated with the given home telecommunications environment is taught at column 3, lines 62 – 64. The entire patent to Mayer is plainly directed to the claimed instructing a telecommunications node (NK1) associated with the remote telecommunications device (EG) to process information associated with user's use of the remote telecommunications device based on the determined home telecommunications node (NK2), thereby emulating the home telecommunications environment for the user.

With respect to claim 14, refer to column 4, lines 56 – 65.

With respect to claims 15 and 25, refer to column 4, lines 31 – 39.

Mayer is silent with respect to the home telecommunications environment comprising a home telecommunications network and the remote telecommunications device associated with a different telecommunications network along with processing signaling information. However, Emery plainly teaches such features in a roaming environment in the Abstract and FIG. 1. Emery clearly teaches two different networks (one of them wireless; re: claims 10 and 24) where the signaling information has to be different to each network. Therefore, it would have been obvious even to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the invention of Mayer

into the multiple network roaming environment of Emery in order to provide even more portability and roaming to the user.

With respect to claim 13, some type of agreement has to be inherent to the system of Mayer in view of Emery or else the system of Mayer in view of Emery could not operate.

5. Claims 2-7, 9, 18-21, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mayer in view of Emery as applied to claims above, and further in view of Sladek et al. (Sladek; US 6,622,016 B1; previously cited and applied).

With respect to claims 2 and 4, refer to column 4, lines 25 - 29 of Mayer.

With respect to claims 3, 5-7, 9, 18-21, and 23, Mayer in view of Emery is silent with respect to the IMS architecture, the IN architecture, the Centrex-based network, and the PBX-based network. However, Sladek plainly teaches the interactions of such architectures and networks in a roaming system; refer to column 14, line 57 to column 15, line 5. Therefore, it would have been obvious even to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the service of Mayer in view of Emery in the architectures and networks of Sladek in order to provide the service of Mayer in view of Emery to a broad spectrum of users.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

6. Claims 16 and 26 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Conclusion***

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 13, and 17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Harry S. Hong whose telephone number is (571) 272-7485. The examiner is normally off on Wednesdays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad F. Matar can be reached on (571) 272-7488. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Harry S. Hong/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2614

December 8, 2008